

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-17 are pending herein.

By this Amendment, claim 2 has been amended to incorporate claim 9 in order to more fully distinguish the invention of the claims over the teachings of the prior art references cited against these claims. Claim 9 has been canceled.

I. Oath/Declaration

The Office Action alleged that the Declaration was defective because the specification to which the Declaration is directed had not been adequately defined.

Attached to this Amendment is a newly executed Declaration. In this newly executed Declaration, box (b) is checked and refers to the present application.

In view of the newly executed Declaration, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because the word "film-like" used for describing the insulating substrate was allegedly vague and did not clearly describe the structure. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, claim 2 is amended to remove the term "film-like." Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are requested.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 2, 4, 13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Zimmerman. The Patent Office alleges that Zimmerman discloses a flexible wiring board comprising a wiring pattern formed of a desired metal on a film-like insulating substrate wherein a reinforcing guide pattern having the same material as that of the wiring pattern is formed on the insulating substrate.

It appears the Patent Office is interpreting the outer periphery of the conductor pattern 14 (see Figure 1) disclosed by Zimmerman as a reinforcing guide pattern. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The flexible wiring board as defined by amended claim 2 comprises a wiring pattern formed of a desired metal on an insulating substrate and a reinforcing guide pattern having a same metal as that of the wiring pattern on the insulating substrate, wherein the guide pattern has guide holes for positioning.

Nowhere does Zimmerman teach or suggest guide holes in the outer periphery of conductor pattern 14. Zimmerman also fails to teach or suggest any other reinforcing guide pattern with guide holes therein. Thus, Zimmerman clearly fails to teach each and every limitation of claim 2.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Zimmerman fails to anticipate the subject matter of claim 2. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Zimmerman in view of Tsukamoto

Dependent claims 3, 5, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Zimmerman in view of Tsukamoto. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to the rejection of claim 9, which subject matter is now in amended claim 2, the Patent Office recognized that Zimmerman discloses registration holes 12 on the substrate, but does not teach the use of guide holes in a reinforcing guide pattern. However, the Patent Office alleged that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the circuit board of Zimmerman with guide holes on the guide pattern, apparently in order to locate the component or element in or on the circuit board.

Here, the Patent Office has not met its initial burden of providing some suggestion or motivation as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified Zimmerman to include a reinforcing guide pattern with guide holes for positioning.

First, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified the outer periphery of the conductor pattern 14 in Zimmerman (alleged by the Patent Office to be the same as a reinforcing guide pattern as discussed above) to include guide holes therein with any reasonable expectation of success. Including guide holes in the conductor pattern 14 itself rather than in a guide pattern separate from the conductor pattern likely would have destroyed the conducting ability of such pattern, and thereby destroyed the device of Zimmerman.

Second, even if one would have been led to have included some different form of registration holes 12 in Zimmerman, which there appears to have been no reason to do so, nothing in Zimmerman and/or Tsukamoto would have led one to have made a wiring pattern and a separate reinforcing guide pattern of the same metal as required in claim 2. Here again, applicant notes that the outer periphery of conductor pattern 14 is not a reinforcing guide pattern with guide holes therein and cannot be made to have guide holes therein as discussed immediately above.

Finally, according to MPEP §706.02(i), "to support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention, or the Examiner must present a convincing line of

reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). This, the Patent Office has not done. The Patent Office has only provided unsupported allegations without explanation as to why one skilled in the art would have modified Zimmerman to include guide holes for positioning on the guide pattern.

With respect to the rejection of claims 3, 5 and 8, even if one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the elements required by claims 3, 5 and 8 in the disclosure of Tsukamoto, the claimed invention still would not have been achieved. Again, nothing in Tsukamoto remedies the deficiencies of Zimmerman discussed above. That is, nothing in the combined teachings of Tsukamoto and Zimmerman would have led one of skill in the art to a flexible wiring board comprising a wiring pattern formed of a desired metal on an insulating substrate and a reinforcing guide pattern having a same metal as that of the wiring pattern on the insulating substrate, and wherein the guide pattern has guide holes for positioning as required by amended claim 2.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Zimmerman in view of Tsukamoto and Further in View of Beck

Dependent claims 13, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Zimmerman in view of Tsukamoto and further in view of Beck. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Even if one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the elements required by claims 13, 14 and 16 in the disclosures of Tsukamoto or Beck, the claimed invention still would not have been achieved. Again, nothing in Tsukamoto or Beck, alone or in combination, remedies the deficiencies of Zimmerman discussed above with respect to the invention of claim 2. That is, nothing in the combined teachings of Beck and/or Tsukamoto

and Zimmerman would have led one of skill in the art to a flexible wiring board comprising a wiring pattern formed of a desired metal on an insulating substrate and a reinforcing guide pattern having a same metal as that of the wiring pattern on the insulating substrate, and wherein the guide pattern has guide holes for positioning as required by amended claim 2.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Zimmerman, Tsukamoto or Beck, whether taken alone or in combination, would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to the invention of claim 2, or any of dependent claims 13, 14 and 16. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-8 and 10-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/rxg

Attachment:
Declaration

Date: June 24, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
